

Tsarkov, Alex

From: Thomas Kane Jr. [TBKane@glastonburylaw.com]

Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2011 8:49 AM

To: Tsarkov, Alex

Subject: SB1094

I write to voice my opposition to SB 1094.

I am a handgun owner. I am also a practicing attorney, father, member of town commissions and a Rotarian. I have never been arrested, nor committed a crime. I am by no means, a "gun nut". I own one handgun, which I purchased shortly after the Petit home invasion. I have a family and was concerned about protecting them, in the event someone entered my home. When I bought the handgun, I researched the various types, sizes, and manufacturers. I finally choose a basic handgun, made by Smith and Wesson, specifically made for home defense, that accepts 15 rounds. It does not have any higher capacity magazine option, just 15 rounds, no more, no less. Many less than many other handguns. I chose not to purchase an ultra-compact gun, the only size handgun which holds 10 rounds, as it is too small to be accurate. And it is my belief that accuracy is more important to safety, then the number of rounds.

I agree that there is little or no need for 30-40 round magazines. However, to set the limit at 10 would render many currently owned handguns, including mine, unusable.

I understand the goal, especially in light of the tragic shooting in Arizona. However, in order to be effective, the law must actually have some deterrent value. Those that follow laws, and abide by them, are usually not the ones who would commit the criminal acts sought to be deterred here. The irony here is that while I, along with most other law abiding handgun owners, would follow the law, and surrender our magazines, criminals would not. Would a criminal, intent on breaking the law, put away the handgun he was going to rob the store with simply because it held 15 rounds in violation of the statutes? Or decide to not commit murder that day because all he had was a 15 round handgun, and he did not want to break the magazine capacity law? Of course not.

Would a person who had illegally purchased a handgun, voluntarily surrender his 15 round magazines to the state, in order to avoid prosecution for them. Of course not.

The statute therefore becomes nothing more than a feel good regulation, without actually improving public safety at all.

Additionally, my weapon would be useless without the 15 round magazine. It is not a large weapon by any standard, it is the first size above a compact. But it cannot accept a smaller magazine, and there are no conversion kits commercially available. The inability to use a 15 round magazine would render my \$700 gun as useful as a small club. Does the state intend to compensate me for the loss of value? I have the weapon, which is worth \$550 and several magazines, worth approximately \$150. It is unfair to force me to surrender the magazines to the state, for no compensation. And to further reduce the value of my weapon to \$0. Multiply that by the number of guns and magazines across the state and the dollar value cost of this legislation becomes immense. This is in addition to the cost of prosecution and investigation for those that do not surrender the magazines. All for a law which would have little or no deterrent value to those it is aimed to stop.

Thank you for taking the time to read this, and I hope you sincerely consider not passing the act at all, but if you do believe a statutory limitation is necessary, please set the limitation much higher.

3/23/2011

Sincerely yours

Thomas Babson Kane
57 Blackledge Drive
Colchester, CT 06415

3/23/2011